

# SUFFRAGE THE ARMOR OF LIBERTY.

## SPEECH OF GENERAL C. C. ANDREWS,

[OF MINNESOTA,

[AT ST. PAUL, OCTOBER 26, 1865,

As Originally Reported in the St. Paul Press.

### FELLOW-CITIZENS:

Our highest duty at this time is to aid all in our power to make the peace lasting and friendly, and to re-establish, not merely a formal union, but a union of hearts. Our financial interests, our interest as a great power, require this; and beyond these considerations every one of us would feel a just pride in that national glory resulting after so great a war, in a great and permanent peace; speedily accomplished. On these points there can be no difference among men who love their country. I shall have the honor to submit to you, that in order to secure this union and peace, the question of slavery and the questions naturally springing out of it, must be settled on principles of justice. In other words, that freedom must be secured in good faith to the freedmen. I shall submit that in order to accomplish this, we must insist that the freedmen have the right of suffrage as protection and security for their freedom. We are each responsible, according to our influence, that freedom is made good to the four millions of blacks of the South, and that they be not left in a worse condition than they formerly were in. If they are left to be treated as an obnoxious race, and their rights trampled in the dust, the people of the United States will be accountable for it: history, and will deserve the reproach of the civilized world. The question of negro suffrage in this State therefore becomes one of great importance. For we could hardly insist that suffrage should be extended to the freedmen if we denied it to the few colored men in our own midst. It is important that Minnesota should meet the question fairly and squarely and act on it with courage as well as candor. If it is right that colored men should vote, let Minnesota so declare.

For myself I would have preferred to remain silent in this canvass, but I thought there was too much indifference on this one important question; and I therefore appeal to the patriotism of the people, and heartily beseech them to bestir themselves.

### RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE.

is the right of saying through the ballot-box who shall make and who shall administer the laws; and on account of its great importance is often mentioned as a sacred trust. It is in the nature of true democracy to be liberal in extending this right. I never apprehended any danger from giving the right to adopted citizens of foreign birth, and I look back to the service I tried to render, by writing in behalf of the rights of naturalized citizens during the Know Nothing excitement, with as much satisfaction as to anything I have ever attempted in civil life. Mr. Burke well said, that in order to love our country, our country must first be lovely. In order that a country may appear lovely to a citizen, it must afford him some rights, some blessings; something better than material comforts; and the more liberty, the more security it affords him, the more lovely it seems to him, and the more will he love it, and the more will he fight for it. Do you suppose our foreign-born citizens would have volunteered so numerously to fight for the Union, or that they would have made such earnest and valiant soldiers, if they had not enjoyed equal political rights with us—if they had not enjoyed the right of suffrage? It is not likely they would have done so. But they felt, and truly felt, that they were fighting for their own country—for a government in which they had an interest. The country seemed lovely to them, and they loved it enough to fight, and die, if need be, for its preservation. Why did the rugged cliffs of Switzerland

them,  
y may  
Lord-  
name  
meet

eding  
er can  
n this  
would  
on in  
inded  
itude  
ht to  
out-  
t the  
owed  
ency  
ut it

,  
RT.

hlet  
ress-  
om-  
all  
ere  
ath-  
try,  
one  
on-  
im-  
ay,  
ith  
ger,  
ing

# SUFFRAGE THE ARMOR OF LIBERTY.

---

## SPEECH OF GENERAL C. C. ANDREWS, [OF MINNESOTA,

[AT ST. PAUL, OCTOBER 26, 1865,

As Originally Reported in the St. Paul Press.

---

### FELLOW-CITIZENS:

Our highest duty at this time is to aid all in our power to make the peace lasting and friendly, and to re-establish, not merely a formal union, but a union of hearts. Our financial interests, our interest as a great power, require this; and beyond these considerations every one of us would feel a just pride in that national glory resulting after so great a war, in a great and permanent peace; speedily accomplished. On these points there can be no difference among men who love their country. I shall have the honor to submit to you, that in order to secure this union and peace, the question of slavery and the questions naturally springing out of it, must be settled on principles of justice. In other words, that freedom must be secured in good faith to the freedmen. I shall submit that in order to accomplish this, we must insist that the freedmen have the right of suffrage as protection and security for their freedom. We are each responsible, according to our influence, that freedom is made good to the four millions of blacks of the South, and that they be not left in a worse condition than they formerly were in. If they are left to be treated as an obnoxious race, and their rights trampled in the dust, the people of the United States will be accountable for it in history, and will deserve the reproach of the civilized world. The question of negro suffrage in this State therefore becomes one of great importance. For we could hardly insist that suffrage should be extended to the freedmen if we denied it to the few colored men in our own midst. It is important that Minnesota should meet the question fairly and squarely and act on it with courage as well as candor. If it is right that colored men should vote, let Minnesota so declare.

For myself I would have preferred to remain silent in this canvass, but I thought there was too much indifference on this one important question; and I therefore appeal to the patriotism of the people, and heartily beseech them to bestir themselves.

### RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE.

is the right of saying through the ballot-box who shall make and who shall administer the laws; and on account of its great importance is often mentioned as a sacred trust. It is in the nature of true democracy to be liberal in extending this right. I never apprehended any danger from giving the right to adopted citizens of foreign birth, and I look back to the service I tried to render, by writing in behalf of the rights of naturalized citizens during the Know Nothing excitement, with as much satisfaction as to anything I have ever attempted in civil life. Mr. Burke well said, that in order to love our country, our country must first be lovely. In order that a country may appear lovely to a citizen, it must afford him some rights, some blessings; something better than material comforts; and the more liberty, the more security it affords him, the more lovely it seems to him, and the more will he love it, and the more will he fight for it. Do you suppose our foreign-born citizens would have volunteered so numerously to fight for the Union, or that they would have made such earnest and valiant soldiers, if they had not enjoyed equal political rights with us—if they had not enjoyed the right of suffrage? It is not likely they would have done so. But they felt, and truly felt, that they were fighting for their own country—for a government in which they had an interest. The country seemed lovely to them, and they loved it enough to fight, and die, if need be, for its preservation. Why did the rugged cliffs of Switzerland

seem so sweet to the patriot Tell? Because they were his home of liberty. Now natural the exulting language of his apostrophe to his native mountains:

"Ye are the things that tower;

Whose smile makes glad, whose frown is terrible.

\* \* \* \* \* I have sat

In my boat at night, when midway o'er the lake  
The stars went out, and down the mountain gorge  
The wind came roaring—I have sat and eyed  
The thunder breaking from his cloud, and smiled;  
To see him shake his lightnings o'er my head;  
And I have thought of other lands, whose storms  
Are summer flaws to those of mine, and just  
Have wished me there—the thought that mine was free  
Has checked that wish, and I have raised my head  
And cried in thralldom to that furious wind—  
Blow on! this is the land of Liberty!

Why is it we hear of discontent and strife in some of the South American Republics? Because of the elements in their governments that are not republican. Because their laws are unequal; they do not guarantee religious liberty. Such governments are not lovely to the proscribed and oppressed. Why is there discontent in the British dominions to-day? Because the masses are denied the right of suffrage. The aristocratic element in England think it dangerous to give the right of suffrage to the poor class of the white men, and so the poor classes under the British government, especially in Ireland, are discontented. Their country would seem more lovely to them if it gave them the privileges that belong to freemen. You will find that those republics have been the most prosperous wherein political privileges were most equally distributed; wherein the people—all the people were trusted. It was so in the republic of Rome, in the age of her highest splendor. It was in the days of her greatest glory that she allowed freedmen to vote. If you would link the hearts of a people together in affection for their country, make it the source of security and blessing to them; let the laws over them be equal in their operation; then the citizen will be a voluntary sentinel and soldier watching the interests of his country and ready and willing to go forth and fight its battles.

#### THE QUALIFICATIONS

or suffrage should be as complete as a high state of civilization and culture can make them. We could wish them greater than they are. Considering that under a popular government those entrusted with suffrage are the source of sovereign power one could wish, though in vain, they had what Shakspeare calls

The king-becoming graces,  
As justice, verity, temperance, stableness,  
Bounty, perseverance, mercy, lowliness,  
Devotion, patience, courage, fortitude.

Mr. Gladstone, in a late speech in the House of Commons, in favor of extending the right of suffrage, says the qualifications which fit a man for its exercise, are "self-command, self-control, respect for order, patience under suffering, confidence in the law, regard for his superiors." I submit there are two other qualities a man should possess to be well qualified to vote—patriotism and independence. To vote right, a man ought to love his country, and be independent enough to vote according to his conscience. If we should restrict all voters to this standard you will agree with me that many white men would be excluded. It is an unpleasant fact that thousands of men are under such constraint from party association that they vote contrary to their honest convictions. And yet it would be absurd to think of selecting out those who literally come within the qualifications, and excluding all others. We must act on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number. To obtain a great good we must sometimes submit to a little evil. I do not think that all colored men are qualified to exercise the right of franchise. But many of them are qualified to vote, and if they are permitted to exercise the right they will become—if we who claim to be superior to them do our duty—every year better qualified to vote. They will become better educated, take more interest in public affairs, hear discussions, read the papers, observe and think, and get better informed, the same as white men have been learning and getting better qualified every year. Learning to vote, like learning to swim, requires practice.

#### NEGRO SUFFRAGE.

Previous to coming to Minnesota I had been in the habit of seeing colored men vote in an Eastern State. It was hardly a noticeable thing, and caused no inconvenience to any one. It was a matter like many others of public importance which excite no dissatisfaction except when they get into party politics. The voting was done as quietly I suppose as it used to be

when free negroes voted in North Carolina, and nobody said aught against it. Therefore when our constitutional conventions—for owing to some party hysterics (caused perhaps by the stimulating nature of our atmosphere—we had, you remember, a couple of conventions—declined to extend the right of suffrage to the colored man, I felt surprised. Especially was I surprised when it was denied to the negro and given to Indians who had adopted the habits of civilization. If a clause in favor of negro suffrage had been inserted in either constitution submitted to the people in 1857, I should have voted for it; and I should have considered it a democratic act. Some of my hearers may remember that in the Presidential canvass of 1860, I complained of the insincerity of the Republicans in refusing to put such a clause into the constitution submitted by their wing of the convention. I remember the Republicans were soundly scolded for their course by some of their own journals.

We sometimes hear people in the North say they "don't care anything about the nigger;" also "that it is impossible for the black race to live with us on terms of political equality—they will die out—they will be exterminated." Now, I consider such sentiments narrow, selfish, mean, anti-democratic, anti-republican. Here is a race of men who generations ago were brought hither by the whites. They are Americans by birth. They know no other country. This is their home. Some of their ancestors served in every war we have had. And yet, because they are black and weaker than the white race, such is the selfishness of men that they are inclined even to deny them their fair and proper name and title as a race, and speak sneeringly of them. Because they have been a down-trodden race they are in dispute—they are "niggers." With ignorant and base minds a sneer—a stigma of reproach upon a man or party goes a great way. It was thus that the phrase, "mean Yankee," had such effect among the rebels. If men are so prejudiced against a race or class as to deny them their true name, we can hardly expect they will be willing to grant them political privileges. This idea that they cannot live at peace with whites is repugnant to Christian civilization. Why can they not live at peace? Is it because they will not obey the laws of society? There is no reason to apprehend they will be disorderly. Why must they be exterminated? What is to hinder their going along peaceably and earning their livelihood, just as they have for a long time? Who is going to be so irritable as to begin a quarrel with them? Who will strike the first blow? Will it be some white man of such narrow views, of such strong prejudices, of such selfish instincts that he must fly into a passion at sight of a colored man meeting with success in the same business as his own. No man with an American heart in him would wish his country to yield to such unworthy sentiments!

I ask if the colored people have not by their good behavior and character contradicted all the unfavorable predictions that were made concerning them before and since the emancipation! You know as well as I that they have. And yet my observation has enabled me to well confirm what you have learned in their favor. Although I was aware that the blacks of the South in general intelligence derived from association with the whites, were much in advance of the blacks of the West India Islands. I was nevertheless much surprised at their moderation, their discretion, their industry and their general good behavior. It had been predicted, you know—wrongfully predicted—that they would make bad use of liberty, that they would resort to acts of cruelty and vengeance. I found that they behaved quite the contrary. I speak from experience in Arkansas, Alabama and Texas. The eagerness of the freed people for knowledge; the rapidity and generosity with which they established schools were surprising. They also attended religious meetings more numerous than they had ever done; and it was plain their hallalujahs were louder than before they were set free. There was but little crime among them; very few had to be arrested. I consider their enthusiasm in the pursuit of knowledge a most striking and promising fact. Then, as to loyalty, we well know how universal, how constant, how discreet, how faithful it has been. How many Federal prisoners have been fed and guided in their escape by black men! Not one that I ever heard of ever betrayed a Union prisoner. At Mobile on the last Fourth of July the black people were the only ones who celebrated the day, and they did it well. Their soldieryship has surprised every one. I never had but one colored regiment in my command,—that was the 57th in Arkansas, and an excellent regiment—but I have seen enough of colored troops to admire their gallantry and efficiency. I have seen them as faithful sentinels over valuable public property—I have seen them as careful pickets. In the siege of Blackely, Hawkins' colored division was on my immediate right. I once passed along their whole line, and the only fault I could find with them was that they were too reckless of their lives. In the victorious assault their valor was of the highest order, and the works were carried so simultaneously in every part that each division claimed the honor of mounting the rebel parapets first. In the battle of Jenkins Ferry, where Gen. Steele defeated a superior force under Kirby Smith, the undaunted courage of the colored troops was specially commended.—In all of our armies where they have fought, good and valiant soldieryship has been their general character. And these men, we are told, cannot exist here as our political equals! How does this sound for a country that claims to be the asylum of the oppressed—the country that receives with open arms the down-trodden and poor of every clime—that has given the

right of suffrage to humble foreigners on their declaring their intention to become citizens? And these blacks—natives of our soil—whose ancestors shouldered the musket in our revolutionary war, and were complimented for heroism by Jackson in the war of 1812, who have fought nobly in the recent war—how will it sound in history, that free, republican America—this asylum for the oppressed—drove this race from her borders! Imagine what serene pleasure there will be for these exclusive men—this *aristocracy of color*—who cannot live under the same government with the black—to remain and enjoy the peace and liberties which these very blacks shed their blood to secure! Louis XIV, by a revolting persecution, expelled the Protestants from France. Spain, under a baneful and malignant star, drove from her borders different sects, and the remnant of a feeble race. But these were acts worthy only of the days of the Inquisition. Let us have no fears that we are falling on such miserable times.

Daniel Webster said in 1850, "If the black race is weaker, that is a reason against, not for, its subjection and oppression." That is an enlightened view of this question which I wish every man would now take. Give the blacks an opportunity to raise the standard of manhood as high as they can. The better they become the happier we shall all be. But how absurd to think that raising the colored man to political equality is bringing the white man down. If you reach out your hand to raise up and improve the poor and weak and oppressed, it makes you a benefactor and raises you up rather than lowers you. Has it lowered the whites because the negroes were liberated? Did it lower the memory of Lincoln because he set the slaves free? Did it degrade white soldiers because black soldiers had equal military rights? No; and no more will it degrade white citizens if the blacks have equal political rights. Did it lower Howard when he went round through the prisons of Europe to take the gauge of human miseries, and alleviate the sufferings of his fellow men?—When and where did it ever lower a man to raise up and improve his fellow creatures? A Territory is inferior to a State. Did it lower the sister States when they accepted the Territory of Minnesota into the Union? or when they accepted Kansas or Oregon? As a matter of fact I suppose it is more creditable to a man to be a citizen of a republic where all the men are freemen than where half are little better than slaves.

#### GIVING THE BLACKS SUFFRAGE WILL PROMOTE GOOD MORALS.

As to social equality with the blacks, none but a simpleton would apprehend that giving them suffrage will produce it. It is a matter which will regulate itself aside from political matters. Social affairs never have and probably never will be much affected or regulated by politics.

If, however, social interests are at all affected by suffrage the effect will be in favor of the negro and in favor of good morals. Probably there will not be so much amalgamation as there has been. Probably there will not be so many mulattoes as heretofore. By giving the negro the right of citizenship you will increase his honor and manhood in a manner that will tend to enable him to protect his sacred rights of family. I therefore boldly advocate suffrage for the colored man as a means of good morals, and I am happy to find I am supported in this by a high authority. The eminent De Tocqueville, in his work on Democracy in America, says that travellers universally agree on this one point: that in no country are morals so strict as in the United States; and he states that it is owing to the "principle of equality." He shows that a cause of immorality in Europe is the liability of the rights and virtue of the inferior classes being invaded by the superior class. But here, the "principle of equality" protects the humble classes. There is no aristocracy nor nobility to invade their sacred family rights. But how has it been in the South where this principle of equality before the law did not exist? Why, there has been amalgamation. Morals have not been so strict there between the whites and blacks. I say, then, give the black man suffrage, and you establish that equality before the law which enables him to defend his right of marriage—you do what the great writer on Democracy says makes morals strict.

If extending to the colored man the rights of manhood would tend to create disturbance or ill-feeling in the community, I hold that the rights he now has, and for a long time has enjoyed, would have manifested some trouble. They have long had the right to own land. "They can buy a lot and build a house by the side of yours. Who complains of this? And yet, is it more objectionable to give them the right to vote? Further privileges than these they have. They can now go into your highest courts as suitors, and have audience before the judge and jury. If you do an injury to a colored man, he can summon you into court, and stand by your side to demand justice. These are equal rights. This has long been and nobody complains. Is it more disagreeable to let them go up to the ballot-box?

But it is said the blacks are not sufficiently educated to exercise the right of suffrage. I answer they are as well educated as many white men who vote. We have no literary qualification for the franchise, nor has it been thought, in this land of common schools, to be practicable or essential. We are all in favor, I trust, of educating the people, white and black, to as high a standard as possible. The better educated the people are the safer will be our

liberties. But there is a good deal of learning besides book learning. There are patriots who cannot read, and there are men who can read that are not patriots. If there is to be a choice between loyal ignorance and disloyal intelligence, I would prefer loyal ignorance. But a man of common sense can in these times, learn which ticket to vote, and then if he has that other qualification—*independence*—he will vote it.

#### SUFFRAGE FOR FREEDMEN.

In regard to suffrage for the freedmen it now appears to me it will be necessary to insist upon it to confirm their freedom, and as a means of protection and self-defence to them. It was soon after the war closed that I first heard of the proposition, and I then thought it was ill-timed, for I did not see that it was necessary. I hoped and rather expected the white people in the South would adopt reasonable and just measures for the protection of the freedmen, and I admit if they had done so, or were showing a purpose to do so, I would not insist on the freedmen having suffrage at present. Six months have passed, and the condition of the freedmen is getting worse instead of better. Out of the reach of military posts they are still held as slaves as a general practice. The majority of whites ridicule the idea of their freedom, and contend that the courts will yet set aside the proclamation. The whites obstruct rather than encourage their education, and they are disposed to make free labor a failure. Organizations exist to prevent them hiring themselves out as they choose. Many have already been killed while attempting to assert their liberty, for in the country the white man carries arms, and the freedman, agreeably to the slave-code, is denied them. They are even denied the poor privilege of testifying in a court of justice.—They have lost that guardianship and protection their former masters once gave them.—They are not free in fact. Do you ask why this is? One reason is that the freed people have been ardently and universally loyal. This is the reason the whites bear down on them now. This is the reason why they were almost invariably butchered when captured during the war. Some of their constitutional conventions have declared—in rather an evasive and reluctant manner, however—that slavery is destroyed. But they decline to submit the constitutions to the people for ratification, a strange and pernicious practice. Some of the public men talk well, but it is doubtful if the people endorse them. Such being the state of things it will doubtless be necessary to insist that the freedmen be invested with suffrage as a means to save them from oppression and destruction. There is an unconditional Union element in each Southern State which will cheerfully acquiesce in such a measure. This element we should foster and not suffer it to be overwhelmed by disloyalty.

#### PEACE DEMOCRACY.

If there were no other ground for my opposing the Democratic platform and ticket, its opposition to negro suffrage would be sufficient cause. This measure is, in reality, democratic. I am not aware of having abandoned any true Democratic principle. I have regarded it a characteristic principle of Democracy to sympathize with the humble classes, and to protect their just rights. The Democratic Republican party carried on the war for "sailor's rights" in 1812. But at length the pro-slavery, aristocratic element began to get control of the Democratic organization as was seen in its indifference to the wrongs to settlers in Kansas—*sneering* at them as "shriekers." This might have been forgiven had it degenerated no more. But when the organization, in spite of many patriotic men who remained in it, went wickedly beyond the legitimate sphere of an opposition party, and gave aid and comfort to the rebels, it occupied the unpatriotic position that the Federalist party did in 1812; a position that made the party odious. It declared the President to be a tyrant, and opposed great measures for carrying on the war. It belittled Union victories, attempted to create discontent by trivial complaints about the expense of the war. In New York its influence caused such disturbance as to require fifty-thousand troops to be diverted from the field in order to preserve order. It constantly predicted failure. Its leaders declared "*you* cannot suppress the rebellion." They did not say "*we* cannot," but "*you* cannot," as if they had no part in it. Their last national platform was so unpatriotic that their candidate, Gen. McClellan, repudiated it. Some time previous to the last Presidential election the rebels put forth extraordinary efforts, and people flocked to join the rebel army. We used to ask the prisoners we captured the cause of the uprising, and they said they wanted to defeat Lincoln! They said that the more they could thwart the Yankees—the more Yankee soldiers they could kill—(I will not say and the more prisoners starve)—the more unpopular they would make the war at the North, and thus aid the success of the Peace Democracy! It was painful indeed to see that the circulation of Democratic journals beyond our lines gave aid and comfort to the enemy. The peace democrats staid at home and controlled the party organization. If I am not mistaken they taxed the property of soldiers to hire substitutes for themselves. So strong are party ties—they are indeed much too strong—that I have searched for some good reason for supporting the Democratic organization. I examined an address issued a few weeks ago by the National Democratic Committee. It breathes a spirit the very opposite of Democracy. It caresses the late rebels and says the

freed people will probably have to be sent out of the country. It is a bid for the support of men who have not purged themselves of disloyalty. It not only opposes negro suffrage but declares the struggle through which the country has passed has rather demonstrated that suffrage is already too liberal—that too much power is already in the hands of the common people. Think of that! Is that Democracy? Why, we have all been exulting in the glorious vindication and triumph of popular institutions as shown by the courage, the patriotism, the patience, and the constancy of the people during the war. Abroad the friends of popular institutions have congratulated us on the success of a people with power in their own hands. But the national Democratic committee sends forth to the world that our experience has raised doubts as to having suffrage as liberal as it is. In favor of the so-called Democrats, it is urged that they have acquiesced in the results of the war and now support the President. But it has been pretty severely said that they were about two months behind the rebels in acquiescing. Then as to their support of the President, I doubt its sincerity. The people elected Mr. Johnson, among other reasons, because they believed he would do justice to the colored race. Mr. Harlan, a member of the cabinet—who has lately advocated negro suffrage in Iowa—wrote a letter, some weeks ago, assuring his friends in Iowa that the President was not opposed to negro suffrage. We remember very well the noble sentiments uttered by Andrew Johnson, in a speech in Nashville, when he promised the colored people he would be a Moses to them and lead them up out of bondage—a speech, I am happy to observe, which has just been re-published in a volume of his select speeches. We remember what he said to the colored regiment the other day, that this was their country as much as anybody else's. Do the Democratic journals and platform makers support such principles? On the contrary they declare this to be a "white man's government," and the men who utter and support such sentiments as the President expresses, they ridicule as "woolly heads."

I have heard it predicted that Jeff. Davis will be the next Democratic candidate for the Presidency. While I do not much apprehend this, I do apprehend and fear that if the influence of those men who control, and during the war, have controlled the Democratic organization, prevails, the rebel States will get back into the Union and the rebel leaders will obtain power, before they have become loyal to the Union. We have seen that the loyal and unconditional Union element of the South has no voice, but the old aristocratic pro-slavery rebel influence still dominates. It shows no penitence, nor does it undo any more of the great wickedness of the rebellion than it is obliged to—or no more than is necessary to secure power. The Democrats—false to their principles, disdaining the poor freedmen and indifferent to the unconditional Union men—eagerly reach forth their hands to this rebel influence to form a coalition and get control of the government. Suppose they succeed. We shall then have repudiation of our war debt, which should be as sacred as our lives, or the government will assume the rebel debt. This or worse evils we shall have. This would be no more infamous than the same influence has attempted before; no more infamous than the monstrous fraud of the Lecompton Constitution, of which Henry A. Wise said the thought of it made the blood rush to his face; no more infamous than that miserable theory that slavery went wherever our flag went in our Territories. I beseech you to take heed that no such reproach is brought upon the country. Bear in mind that I have not complained of the southern people because they show so little sincere loyalty. They having for twenty years earned to spurn the North and hate the Union, it would be singular indeed if they could now throw up their hats for the Union. I bear them no ill will. I would not do them the smallest injustice. What I demand is that they be restored to political power only as fast as they bear true faith to the Union.

Fellow-citizens: what we should all insist upon is that the people of the South shall have political power as fast as they become truly loyal, and no faster. As Lord Bacon says, we should take time to make haste. The evil that caused the war must be entirely removed. Nothing of slavery should linger to cause dissension. Then we can have a Union that will be durable; and if we leave a debt to the future, we shall leave a country strong and prosperous enough to pay it. But I warn you, as you desire peace to the country, you do not permit the rebel States so to re-enter the Union that Loyalty will still have to hide in the mountains and Freedom skulk in the cane brake!

The people ought to be glad when they can do a serviceable thing to their State so easily by their vote. When one citizen speaks, he is liable to be disputed, and exerts but limited influence. But there is something great in the voice of an entire State. How eloquent, how convincing, when it is on the side of humanity, and tends to bless the country.

A few days ago I was in one of our eastern cities when the news came by telegraph of the result of the election in the noble and gallant State of Iowa. It was posted up in large letters at all the newspaper offices—"Iowa 20,000 Union majority," and as the great concourse of people hurried along the streets, they looked up and read: "Iowa 20,000 Union majority!" And then their thoughts flew off to the mighty West, so unalterably steadfast to the Union. And so when the news of the election in Minnesota—queen of the Prairies and the Lakes—goes



forth on the electric wires into all the cities of the land, let it be that the multitudes that throng their streets can read the thrilling words on the bulletin boards: "Minnesota gives 20,000 Union majority!" Let her voice sound clearest and loudest. Let her flag float highest on the breeze!

## TESTIMONY ON RECONSTRUCTION.

Extract from General Andrews' testimony before the joint committee of Congress on Reconstruction:

WASHINGTON, March 14, 1866.

Brevet Major General Christopher C. Andrews sworn and examined.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Question. Have you, at any time since the cessation of hostilities, been in Texas? If so, please state how long you were there, and what opportunities you had to ascertain the views and feelings of the people there in regard to the government and authority of the United States.

Answer. I was in command of the district of Houston, Texas, from July 8, 1865, until about the middle of the following August. During that time I visited several of the posts in the district, among them Beaumont, Liberty, Brenham, and Columbus. And, in obedience to orders, I also accompanied Governor Hamilton to Austin, and was present when he was inaugurated in the capitol of the State. From there I went to San Antonio and returned by the way of Columbus to Houston; while on duty at Houston I saw, daily, planters and others from various parts of the State.

Question. State what you found, in your intercourse with the people of Texas, to be their temper and disposition towards the government and authority of the United States.

Answer. I thought there was a fine Union element in Texas; some of the best men appeared to be very well disposed to a restoration of the Federal authority and the return of the State into the Union. Some of the influential men there realize the true state of affairs—I include some of those who participated actively in the rebellion—and they are disposed to be liberal in regard to the freedmen, and to accept heartily and readily the condition. But a large majority of the white people of Texas were still disloyal, and still entertained a hope of re-establishing slavery. It was common for them to tell their former slaves, now free, that the proclamation of emancipation would be set aside. There was a sort of disdain exhibited towards the northern people, and a disposition to spurn the Federal authority. My means of forming an opinion of the state of feeling were, conversation with all classes of people, including Union refugees who had returned, freedmen, and planters. I thought the Union sentiment at Austin was very good; at New Braunfels, a German settlement, I thought the loyal sentiment was specially good.

Question. Where did you find the Union feeling the strongest—in those neighborhoods where the troops were located and the people were protected by military force, or in those neighborhoods where there was no military force, and where the people had little or no military protection?

Answer. There was certainly more expression of loyalty in the neighborhood of military posts than elsewhere. The presence of the military authority seemed to develop and encourage loyal sentiments. So far as I have observed, wholesome government and restraint have tended to increase the respect for the Federal flag. It was common to see the people conversing with the common soldiers, and I think the impression produced by the behavior of the soldiers was favorable to the cause of loyalty.

Question. In your judgment, what would be the effect upon the growth of loyal sentiment and the interests of the loyal people of Texas to withdraw altogether the military forces of the United States from that country?

Answer. I think it would be extremely injurious to the cause of loyalty, assuming that the troops are well disciplined.

Question. Would the Union people of Texas venture to express their sentiments and organize as a Union party at this time, in the absence of military protection?

Answer. I have no reason to think they would; the weight of public opinion was strongly against the unconditional Union element.

Question. What is your opinion as to the necessity and value of the Freedmen's Bureau, or some agency of that kind in Texas at this time?

Answer. I think it very essential; there were shown to me copies of blank forms of contracts which appeared to have been agreed upon by planters and others who wished to hire freedmen, which, if enforced strictly, would barely give the freedman his board and clothes; there were so many deductions for loss of time, and charges for medical attendance, and care of children, &c. My opinion was asked in regard to the matter, and I said that I considered such a form of contract very unfair to the freedman. Unless the freedmen are protected by

the government they will be much worse off than when they were slaves, because they will not have the protection they formerly had from their owners and masters. There was a disposition among the majority of the white people to get the labor of the freedmen at as cheap rates as possible, and to coerce them to accept such rates.

Question. In case the people of Texas were left entirely to themselves, without any control by the government of the United States, into whose hands would the affairs of the State pass—the hands of the Union portion of the people, or the hands of the disloyal portion?

Answer. I suppose there is no doubt they would pass into the hands of the disloyal portion of the people.

Question. Would you consider it safe and judicious to withdraw, at this time, the control of the Federal Government over the people of Texas?

Answer. I would not.

Question. Without questioning you as to details, I wish you would state all the information you have which you may deem necessary to show fully the sentiments of the people of Texas in regard to the restoration of Federal authority there, their treatment of the freedmen, their feelings in relation to the confederacy, and, generally, all opinions you may have upon that subject.

Answer. Unfortunately, it has been a common sentiment in the South that northern people were their inferiors; and during the war this sentiment was increased—their songs, their speeches, their literature, all tending to belittle the "Yankees." The conduct of our armies has changed this feeling somewhat; but it still exists to a considerable extent. Where there has been a lack of any penitence, but instead of it a lofty spirit of disdain, magnanimity towards such on the part of the government appears to have been wasted. Three or four thousand oaths of allegiance were voluntarily taken in my district in the course of a month; but learning it was common for those who took the oath to treat it in a frivolous and sneering manner, the provost marshal was instructed to administer it to those only whom he had good reason to believe would honestly observe it. The object of taking the oath seemed to be to get restored to the privileges of citizenship, and not as any token of devotion to the government. My opinion then was, and is now, that the disloyal people should have been made to understand that the privilege of franchise which they had forfeited was a high trust, to be extended to those only who should become heartily and unconditionally loyal. To be endowed in a wholesale manner with the sacred right of franchise was much greater indulgence than they ever expected. In regard to the freedmen, the prevailing opinion among the whites was that free labor would be a failure. Not having any hope of success, they were reluctant to attempt giving it a trial. They insisted that the whip was the only means of making the blacks work. In some instances planters, who had dealt honorably and humanely towards their slaves, had no difficulty in retaining them the same as ever on their plantations—the blacks confiding in their honor in regard to pay.

There was, however, so much said by the whites about slavery being re-established in the future that the freed people acquired a distrust as to their freedom, and were uneasy and apprehensive about their future condition. This made them, as a general thing, reluctant to hire out to their former masters. Serving others under contracts of their own making seemed to assure them of their freedom. Beyond the influence of military posts the blacks were still held as slaves. There was a general disposition among the whites to depreciate the capacity and merits of the freedmen, and to sneer at the idea of their going to school. I had reason to believe a number of freedmen had been murdered without the slightest provocation. There were instances where a freedman was attempting to leave his former master, and was followed and shot. In case a colored man was killed, a story was immediately started of his having been guilty of some aggravated crime. And it is an important fact, that, where blacks were killed, no white resident interposed to bring the offender to justice. The freedmen were confidently towards the whites because the latter treat them as an abject and inferior race, and are unwilling to concede to them the merits they possess. The whites, in my opinion, can only gain their confidence and friendship by a frank and sincere acknowledgment of their liberty and a just acquiescence in reasonable measures for the protection of their liberty. This, I think, will secure harmony between the two races. And it is vastly essential to the cause of the Union, in my opinion, that if any are to have the right of suffrage, they should have it who are and have been the true friends of the Union, and without regard to color.—*Report of Joint Committee on Reconstruction, 1st Session, Thirty-Ninth Congress, Part IV., pages 124, 125.*

N

AN 1

AUT

LO